

Comment Categories - updated

Category	Page #
1. Stating general opposition to uranium mining, drilling and uranium waste disposal, especially in the Black Hills (without more specific information).	1
2. General concerns for impacts to Native Americans/the sacred Black Hills.	22
3. Concerns about tribal trust responsibilities and tribal treaty rights .	44
4. Concerns about respect to Native Americans (e.g. having a Lakota translator present at the hearings, even proposing the draft permits is an affront).	92
5. Concerns about EPA's tribal consultation process , including adequate survey of cultural sites.	99
6. Native American narratives (historic, present day, etc.).	151
7. Concerns about general environmental impacts.	185
8. Concerns for contamination of surface water and the Cheyenne River.	218
9. Concerns about impacts to aquifers & contamination of drinking water (including future need for water due to effects of climate change).	235
10. Other climate change-related comments.	406
11. Concerns about seismic activity related to injection activity.	407
12. Concerns about hydraulic fracturing.	420
13. Concerns about the presence of faults, fractures, breccia pipes, historical exploration boreholes or any other breaches in confining zones.	420
14. Concerns about the proposed aquifer exemption.	464
15. Concerns specifically about uranium ISR.	483
16. Against uranium mining in general.	508
17. Against uranium mining because of problems with nuclear power generation and nuclear weapons.	521
18. Concerns about the price of uranium, future demand for uranium and future viability of nuclear energy.	549
19. Concerns about effects of past uranium mining.	564
20. Concerns about Azarga (e.g. integrity of investors, integrity of company itself, solvency, experience in the ISR industry, etc.).	586
21. Issuance of these draft permits seems contrary to EPA's mission.	612
22. Concerns about ability of EPA to provide adequate oversight of the project or require clean-up because of uncertain future of EPA.	630
23. Concerns about adequate monitoring (mistrust of Azarga/Powertech fulfilling monitoring requirements, the permit needs to contain additional monitoring requirements, no way to adequately monitor to prevent contamination, etc.)	638
24. Comments about plans for injection of fluids received from outside the Dewey-Burdock Area.	651
25. Comments on draft Environmental Justice Analysis document.	658
26. Comments on draft Cumulative Effects Analysis document.	671
27. Comments on draft NHPA document.	682
28. Comments in support of the project.	682
29. Comments on EPA hampering the project (e.g. EPA taking too long to issue draft permits or permit requirements are too stringent).	707
30. General questions about the EPA permitting and public review processes.	736

31. List of questions asked: (divided into rhetorical questions & questions for EPA to answer in the response to comments)	750
32. Specific technical comments related to errors or suggested changes in the draft permits and fact sheets, separated into Class III, Class V, and general/both.	750
<i>Class III</i>	
<i>Class V</i>	758
<i>General/both</i>	767
33. EPA needs to conduct further investigation.	771
34. General information about Edgemont and the public hearings.	781
35. Concerns the project will not benefit Edgemont, the Counties, the States or the USA.	784
36. Comment topic unrelated to the UIC draft permits & aquifer exemption.	802
37. Any additional topics not included in the above list.	817
38. Comments about other government agencies or regulatory programs (NEPA, the Clean Air Act, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, etc.)	855
39. Comments about the cost or technical feasibility of treating/remediation of contaminated groundwater	876
40. Comments about baseline monitoring/data collection	884
41. Comments about Igloo/the Black Hills Army Depot	887
42. Comments about Crow Butte	898
43. Comments about financial responsibility, bond amounts, etc.	909
Additional Topic-ESA from SD Game, Fish and Parks	